DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 233 CG 002 787

By-Shaw, Merville C.; Rector, William
INFLUENCING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: GROUP COUNSELING WITH TEACHERS. MONOGRAPH NUMBER 6.
Pub Date Jul 68
Note-83p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40
Descriptors-*GROUP COUNSELING, RESEARCH, SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER PARTICIPATION

Teachers in 23 elementary schools and three junior high schools were invited to participate in counseling groups. Groups were successfully formed in 20 schools. Teacher reactions to a first and a second series of five group counseling sessions were positive. Teacher reactions by age, years of educational experience, and years at the present school are presented. The reactions of elementary and junior high school teachers were compared. Correlations among the teacher reaction items were analyzed. The counselors were positive about the rapport, interaction, and freedom from insistence upon a didactic approach during their group sessions. However, they were cautious in generalizing about group outcomes and reported moderate amounts of hostility. The correlations between parent and counselor responses are discussed. Teacher attendance patterns for the group counseling series are analyzed. Generally, results show that: (1) public school guidance personnel can do the job of teacher group counseling; (2) teachers will accept the opportunity for group work when offered; (3) higher attendance patterns were found among teachers of culturally deprived children; (4) teacher reactions are generally positive; and (5) public school counselor perceptions of group process variables are valid in terms of their relationship to teacher perceptions of outcomes and attendance patterns. (Author/PS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDANCE
RESEARCH
PROJECT

Influencing the Learning Environment: Group Counseling With Teachers

Monograph #6

Merville C. Shaw and William Rector

ED022211

WESTERN REGIONAL CENTER
OF THE INTERPROFESSIONAL RESEARCH
COMMISSION ON PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

CHICO STATE COLLEGE
CHICO, CALIFORNIA

CG 002 787

ERRATUM: The symbol $\overline{\overline{X}}$ should be ignored in Tables 2-R, 2-S, 2-T; 3-B; 4-A, 4-B; 5-E, 5-F, 5-H, 5-I, 5-J.

Influencing the Learning Environment: Group Counseling with Teachers

Merville C. Shaw, Director

and

William H. Rector, Associate Director

Western Regional Center of
the Interprofessional Research Commission on
Pupil Personnel Services

Chico State College
Chico, California

July, 1968

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1. Introduction 1
    - The Teacher Groups 2
    - Group Structure 3
    - Administrative Determinant in Participation 3
    - Design 4
    - The Assessment of Outcomes 5
    - Table 1-A 8
2. Teacher Responses to the Post-Series Reaction Sheet 9
    - PSRS Results by Age, Years of Experience in Education and Years at Present School 11
    - PSRS Responses by Academic Level 14
    - PSRS Responses by District 16
    - Intracorrelations of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet 18
    - Tables 2-A through 2-T 20-35
3. Counselor Reactions to Teacher Group Counseling 37
    - Tables 3-A through 3-B 40-41
4. Relationships between Teacher and Counselor Perceptions 43
    - Tables 4-A through 4-B 47
5. Teacher Attendance and Related Variables 49
    - Intracorrelation of Attendance Variables 52
    - Relationship of Attendance to Demographic Variables 53
    - Interrelationships between Attendance and Responses to the PSRS 55
    - Attendance and Counselor Responses on the CRSG 57
    - Tables 5-A through 5-J 59-66
6. Summary 67
    - Feasibility 67
    - Teacher Reactions 67
    - Counselor Reactions 70
    - Relationships between Teacher and Counselor Perceptions 71
    - Teacher Attendance 72

References 77

Appendices

A. Post-Series Reaction Sheet (Teacher)
B. Counselor Reactions to Specific Group
C. General Counselor Reactions

Chapter 1

Introduction

Public school pupil personnel specialists ordinarily think primarily in terms of providing services directly to children. This point of view is well illustrated in a recent position taken by the American School Counselor Association to the effect that school counselors should spend a minimum of 50% of their time in providing direct counseling services to children. (Loughary, et al, 1965) Similar points of view appear to prevail within the ranks of school psychologists and school social workers.

It appears, however, that if such services are to have any significant impact on any large segment of the student population, then new means of providing services must be developed. In the field of school psychology this point of view has been dramatically stated by both Trachtman and Gray. Gray (1963) has indicated the need to discover new ways for the school psychologist to work effectively; while Trachtman (1961) has suggested that it will be necessary for the school psychologist to consider the school as his client rather than individual children.

School social work, too, has moved away from a previous position, which, in effect, was that everything occurring outside the school was in the province of the school social worker (Cook, 1945), to a more generalized kind of position (Kelley, 1964). As a matter of fact, it does not seem unreasonable to state that among those who appear to be in the forefront of the thinking in each of these three professions there is a distinct trend toward increasing similarity of function at least among the various guidance professions (Shaw, 1967).

While there is agreement, at least among a few of the more advanced thinkers in the general area of guidance, that the role of the guidance specialist in providing direct services to children will probably be altered in the future, theoretical models delineating this position and the presuppositions involved are generally nonexistent. A rudimentary effort in this direction has appeared in the literature (Shaw and Tuel, 1966). The model which was suggested in this article attempts to make the case for the pupil personnel specialist as an expert in bringing about environmental modifications, both in the home and the school, which result in more effective learning on the part of students.

The data included here are a part of that which has been collected specifically to provide a partial test of this model. The two basic experimental steps which have been taken to date include the provision of opportunities for parents in selected grades in participating schools to become involved in parent counseling groups. Some of the data collected on this phase of the project have been reported previously (Shaw and Rector, 1966) (Shaw and Rector, 1968). The second phase of the model which has been experimentally implemented has been the provision of group counseling to volunteer groups of teachers in participating schools. It is a part of the data which have resulted from this latter phase of the project which are presented here.

The Teacher Groups

Attempts to form counseling groups for teachers were made in a total of twenty-six schools in five districts. Schools included three junior high schools and twenty-three elementary schools. Groups were successfully formed in twenty of the twenty-six schools. In some schools the number of teachers who responded made it necessary to form more than one group. Table 1-A reports the total number of teachers in each of the twenty participating schools, the number of teachers in each school who participated in teacher group counseling and teacher attendance at each meeting. Examination of this table will reveal that in some schools a very high proportion of teachers became involved in group counseling. As a matter of fact, although no school indicates that all of its teachers were involved in the process, there were some schools where 100% of the available teachers voluntarily involved themselves in the process. Lack of availability is defined as schedule conflicts which prevented individuals from participating.

Group Structure

Administrative Determinant in Participation

Although there are undoubtedly differences of an individual nature between teachers who participated and teachers who did not participate in group counseling, there was also one situational variable which appeared to be significant. At the moment, it does appear appropriate to say that the crucial situational variable which determined degree of teacher participation was administrative support. While no building principal was patently opposed to pupil personnel services, it is to be remarked that in all six of the schools where it proved impossible to form groups administrative support of guidance generally, not just of this project, is best described as "neutral." These administrators responded typically, for example, that they did not plan to make increased use of guidance services in their school in the next six months.

In marked contrast, those schools where teacher turnout was greatest were headed by principals whose general responses to guidance and the utilization of guidance services were enthusiastic. While there has been much expression of opinion with respect to the significance of administrative support in relation to the effectiveness of guidance services, the present study seems to offer evidence to support the idea that the effectiveness of pupil services is lessened when administrative support is neutral or negative.

Design

Complete reports on the rationale and design of the total project have been presented elsewhere (Shaw and Tuel, 1964, Shaw and Tuel, 1965). For this reason, only those procedures specifically relevant to the teacher groups will be reported here. It was decided at the outset that all teachers in participating schools would have an opportunity to participate in two series of group counseling meetings, each series to consist of five sessions. The first series of teacher discussion groups was initiated in the fall, not longer than four weeks after the beginning of the parent discussion groups which were also being carried out in the same school. The second series was initiated in the spring within four weeks after the beginning of the second semester. All teacher participation was voluntary and no "credit" of any kind accrued to those who participated.

Project counselors (who were in every case employees of the participating school district) met with the faculties of the schools originally included to inform them of the general kinds of information coming from the parent group discussions and to invite teachers to participate in the teacher group counseling series. A faculty meeting was also utilized prior to the initiation of any teacher groups in order to administer the instruments used to evaluate outcomes of the teacher groups. These instruments were administered to all teachers so that data could be obtained from teachers who did not participate as well as those who participated in the teacher groups.

Arrangements with respect to time and place of meetings was left entirely to the discretion of the individual who had the responsibility of eliciting teacher participation. A wide variety of times was used, but the two most frequently used times were the hour immediately before school began or the hour immediately after school was dismissed for the day.

Unique scheduling arrangements in a few schools permitted some teacher groups to meet during the actual school day.

Training in group process was provided to the teacher group leaders, but no attempt to control specific counselor behaviors was made. The two limitations imposed on counselor functioning within the groups was that the meetings could not be didactic and that the areas of discussion must be limited to those over which individual teachers had control. The main thrust was to be an emphasis on discussion of issues and problems of general concern to teachers in their professional life. Discussions of school policy or other matters not within the capacity of an individual teacher to influence directly were discouraged. The counselors were provided with a series of possible group discussion topics in case they encountered difficulty in obtaining group participation. This was done, however, more to provide security for the counselors than for any other reason. There was no agenda, apart from issues which the participants themselves wished to bring for consideration.

Individuals utilized as teacher group counselors included school psychologists, school social workers, school counselors, speech therapists and nurses. The individuals were self-selected within each school district. Most had previously participated in parent group counseling in the previous year. A three day training session was held prior to the inception of the teacher groups and most participating counselors had been involved in a similar training program carried out by project personnel in the previous year. No problems relevant to professional specialization were encountered during the course of the research.

The Assessment of Outcomes

The total project has collected data of four types. They include the following:

1. Determination of the feasibility of the approach.
2. Attitudes of positiveness or negativeness manifested by various participating role groups, including parents, teachers and guidance specialists.
3. Attitudinal changes in group participants resulting from participation in the study.
4. Behavior differences in children affected by those who have participated in the study.

The purpose of the present report is to provide data of the first two types in the above list which stem from teacher participation in group counseling.

Table 1-A indicates the number of teachers in each school who participated in the group counseling. In addition this table reflects the number of sessions, out of those held, which participating teachers actually attended. Attendance records were kept for this purpose. Another way of examining attendance data is to do so in terms of the counselors involved. Once groups have been started, it is to be expected that the holding power of a group may be particular to that group. Table 1-A also permits inspection of this data. Beyond this, the relationship of attendance to teacher and counselor perceptions of the group experience is a significant area for study.

In addition, each teacher who participated in a group was asked to complete a Post Series Reaction Sheet (Appendix A). This brief form was intended to elicit significant teacher reactions to their participation in the group counseling experience. Each counselor was also asked to respond to a form at the completion of each group. This form is entitled "Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups" and a copy appears in Appendix B. These instruments are identical to similar instruments utilized to obtain parent and counselor responses to their participation in parent group counseling.

All counselors also completed a General Counselor Reaction form following the conclusion of their participation in the study. A copy is included in Appendix C.

Following completion of the groups in the spring all teachers in participating schools were readministered the psychological scales to which they had responded in the fall.

TABLE 1-A

	N*	Total No. in Group	Series 1 Attendance 1	2	3	4	5	Coun. Code	Total No. in Group	Series 2 Attendance 1	2	3	4	5
DISTRICT A														
School 1	16	6	6	6	3	4	3	011						
School 2	45	10	10	9	9	10	10	131	10	9	9	10	9	9 ***
		7	6	7	6	5	5	132						
School 3	28	12	7	4	5	5	8							
School 4	25	8	6	6	6	8	8	061	5	4	3	4	4	4 ***
		8	8	8	8	6	8	161						
School 5	27	9	7	8	6	4	5							
DISTRICT B														
School 1	10	8	4	7	6	7	8	311						
School 2	20	8	7	5	6	7	8	341	6	4	5	4	4	5
School 3	20	12	7	6	9	4	3	312						
School 4	13	7	7	7	2	1	3	321	6	5	5	5	5	6
School 5	20	11	10	7	5	7	5	331	7	6	4	5	6	5
DISTRICT C														
School 1	18	10	8	8	5	4	4							
DISTRICT D														
School 1	41	12	11	8	12	10	**	511	12	10	11	12	8	**
DISTRICT E														
School 1	29	9	6	8	6	7	8	732	6	5	4	5	2	4
School 2	18	9	9	6	6	4	5	751	7	6	3	3	4	5
School 3	28	6	5	4	3	4	4							
School 4	28	12	12	11	8	6	7							
School 5	24	12	11	8	7	8	8							
School 6	27	12	12	12	6	4	4							
School 7	23	5	4	4	4	2	2							
School 8	15	14	12	13	9	11	10							

* Number of teachers in school
** No meeting No. 5
*** Series 2 meetings were combined.

Chapter 2

Teacher Responses to the Post-Series Reaction Sheet

The Post-Series Reaction Sheet was designed to elicit the subjective responses of group participants to their experience. It consists of five items which can be responded to objectively (Items No. 1, 2, 3, 3a and 4) and five items which must be responded to in a more subjective way (Items No. 1a, 2a, 5, 6 and 7). A copy will be found in Appendix A.

All participants in the teacher groups were requested to complete a copy of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet following the completion of each series. All teachers who participated in even a single meeting of the five which comprised a series were requested to complete this form. The data reflected in this chapter deal only with the objective items contained on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet.

Table 2-A reflects the means and standard deviations for each of the five objective items of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet for all individuals who participated in the groups. Response to Item 1 was in a positive direction, but not overwhelmingly so. This would indicate that teacher participants taken as a group tended to be somewhat neutral or slightly positive in response to a question relating to the helpfulness of the group discussions. It should be pointed out that responses to this item are considerably more positive following Series 2 than following Series 1, so much so that it can be reasonably claimed that responses moved from a slightly positive to a positive position from Series 1 to Series 2. It should also be noted that the standard deviation was smaller following Series 2 than Series 1.

Responses to a question asking if negative results had accrued from group participation indicate clearly that following both Series 1 and Series

2 teachers as a group did not see that negative results had eventuated from their group participation. Differences in means following Series 1 and Series 2 indicate that those teachers who participated in Series 2 were somewhat more prone to see negative results coming from their participation than were those who participated in Series 1. This is an interesting finding and it appears to be somewhat paradoxical in the light of the results obtained on Item 1 above. A partial explanation of this may be seen in the standard deviations following Series 1 and Series 2. The standard deviation is considerably higher following Series 2. This would indicate that the very slightly more negative results on this item came from the more extreme ratings of a few individuals. These outcomes are in some respects similar to the results of a previous study (Shaw and Rector, 1968) in which some parents who participated longest in group counseling also expressed certain negative feelings about the groups. It was hypothesized in that instance, and is hypothesized here, that perhaps some of those who remain longest in group counseling may have serious concerns which are not amenable to change in the relatively brief time encompassed by these counseling groups. Their more negative ratings may reflect their disappointment that initial expectations were not met.

Means obtained from Item 3 are difficult to interpret. It appears that most teachers did not perceive changes in child behavior following participation in Series 1. As was true for Item 1, this picture changes considerably following Series 2 and moves to the positive side of the scale. In this instance, as was true of Item 2, the standard deviation increases following Series 2, indicating that the movement of the mean to a more positive direction was brought about by the ratings of relatively few members of the group. Responses to Item 3a indicate that changes observed following both Series 1 and Series 2 were clearly in a positive rather than a negative direction.

It is interesting to note that nearly all participants, in spite of some other neutral responses, would recommend participation in similar groups to their fellow teachers. This response was nearly unanimous following Series 1 and was completely unanimous following Series 2 for all teachers who responded.

Table 2-B reports on identical Post-Series Reaction Sheet data obtained on teachers, but in this instance the data reflected are reported on the basis of group means rather than individual means . The data were analyzed in this way as well as the previous way in order to determine whether or not a summary of individual responses would mask wide variations among the groups. Table 2-B tends to indicate that this did not occur. Although responses are very slightly more positive when the data are examined in this way, there are no gross changes. The standard deviations are reduced, in some instances dramatically so, providing further indication that gross differences in response did not occur as a result of variations among groups.

PSRS Results by Age, Years of Experience in Education and Years at Present School

Still another way of viewing data is to view it from the point of view of certain characteristics of the individual participants. In this instance, the demographic characteristics selected were the age of the participants, the number of years of experience they had had in public education and the number of years they had been at a specific school. Tables 2-C through 2-G report these data for Series 1.

Responses to Item 1 report results obtained from Question 1 when data are considered in these three ways. This item indicates whether or not teachers felt that group discussions had been helpful to them. It is clear that the youngest age group responded more positively to this item than did any other age group, if alternatives 4 and 5 are considered positive, alternatives 1 and 2 considered negative and alternative 3 as neutral. It is also clear that increasing age brought about more generally negative responses to group participation and that the middle two age groups tended to be the most neutral of the four age categories.

When responses to this item are examined from the point of view of years of experience in education of the participants, it is clear that the oldest age group had the fewest positive and the most negative responses; while the median age group had the most positive and the youngest age group the least negative responses. The number of neutral responses increases slightly but systematically from least to most years of experience in education. When viewed from the point of view of how long teachers have been at the school where they now teach, the results which obtained above largely obtain here. The main difference would be that those in the 0 - 4 and 5 - 9 categories obtained essentially similar responses, with the major differentiation occurring between these two groups and the group which has been longest at the school. As might be anticipated, the smallest proportion of positive responses and the highest proportion of negative responses is found in this group.

Table 2-D reports on Question 2 of the PSRS, which relates to whether or not teachers perceived negative results from their participation in the counseling groups. Few age differences of any relevance are apparent in responses to this question. When viewed from the point of view of number of years experience in education, some differentiations are seen. The group with a median amount of experience in education is clearly more negative in response to this item than either of the other two groups;

while the group with the greatest amount of experience is most positive. There are slight indications of negative responses in the youngest age group, but the proportion is very small.

When observed from the perspective of the number of years teachers have taught in a particular school, few differences are observable. There is a very slight tendency for those who have taught longest in a specific school to be more neutral and for those who have taught the least number of years in a specific school to be more negative, but neither of these outcomes appears meaningful.

With regard to this particular item, it would appear that the number of years of experience in education is more sensitive to within-group differences than either the chronological age of the participants or the number of years teaching experience in a particular school. Those who have taught a median number of years clearly perceive more negative outcomes from the group experience than either of the other two experience groups.

Responses to the question "Have there been any recent changes in your pupils' behavior in class and other social situations?" are reflected in Table 2-E. Few differences among various categories are observable in this table. There is a slight tendency for individuals in the 40-49 age category to take more extreme positions than those which characterize any of the other age groups. The same tends to be true of those who have had 20-29 years of experience in education and those who have been 5-9 years at their present school. In all three cases, these groups are most negative but in the case of those who have been 5-9 years at the present school they are also the most positive.

Table 2-F reflects the response to the item "Have these changes been for the better or worse?" When age is the factor taken into account, the two younger age groups see all changes as having been for the better. The older age groups report a substantial proportion of changes which they see as being for the worse.

When number of years of experience in education is the category considered, it is apparent that those with the most experience tend to see such changes as being uniformly for the better, while a very low proportion of individuals in the two youngest categories saw them as being for the worse. When the category number of years at the present school is examined, it is seen that all negative responses come from individuals who have been in the present situation less than five years. The number of responses to this item are so few within each category, particularly negative ones, that it would not be appropriate to make generalizations about negative responses in this category. It does appear safe to say that nearly all teachers who did perceive behavior changes perceive them as being for the better.

Table 2-G reflects responses to Item 4, "Would you recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers who have pupils with academic problems?" Responses are overwhelmingly positive, but are most positive for the youngest age group, the group with fewest years at their present school and the group with the most experience in education.

PSRS Responses by Academic Level

Tables 2-H through 2-L report teacher responses when viewed from the point of view of the academic level at which they originated. Inspection of Table 2-H indicates that the only differences between elementary and junior high school levels on Item 1 during the fall series occur at the positive end of the continuum, with the elementary teachers tending to respond most favorably. A greater differentiation on this item follows the spring teacher counseling series, with the elementary group tending to respond more frequently at the most positive level but also more frequently at the median response point. A higher proportion of negative responses is seen at the junior high level than at the elementary level, but the most negative response category is not utilized by either level following the second series.

The differential responses of elementary and junior high teachers to Item 2 are reflected in Table 2-I. Following the fall series, junior high teachers indicated that there had been no negative results from their participation in group discussion, while elementary teachers, in small proportion, indicated that there had been. The response pattern following the spring series was quite different. There was a decline in favorableness of response at both elementary and junior high levels, with the greatest decline coming at the junior high level. It must be remembered that the smaller number of responses at the junior high level probably makes these statistics highly unreliable. At the same time, the fact that a decline took place at both levels probably indicates that the change is real.

Responses to Item 3, reflected in Table 2-J, indicate a clear differentiation between elementary and junior high teachers. Following the fall series, elementary teachers are the only ones who report changes in child behavior, if Categories 4 and 5 are assumed to be indicative of this phenomenon. Even in the median response category, elementary responses are proportionately higher than junior high responses. Following the spring series, there is a much more favorable shift in the junior high responses but the same shift occurs, and with greater emphasis, among the elementary teachers. Again it should be cautioned that the small response n at the junior high level following the spring series should be cause for doubting the reliability of these proportions, but since the shift is seen both at the elementary and junior high level it may reflect the real situation. It appears that elementary teachers to a much stronger degree than junior high teachers did perceive changes in child behavior.

Responses to Question 3a appear to follow the same general pattern as responses to Question 3. Results are reported in Table 2-K. Following the fall series, nearly all teachers reported that child behavior changes were for the better. The proportion was not as favorable for the junior high teachers, but again small numbers of responses at the junior high level make interpretation difficult. Following the spring series, both groups report that behavior changes were all in the "better" direction. Responses to Item 4 fell nearly 100% in the "yes" category for both elementary and junior high groups following the fall and the spring series. Only one person responded no, and this individual was an elementary teacher. Table 2-L reports these results.

It would appear that generally speaking elementary teachers perceived their group participation to have been more profitable than did junior high teachers. Favorableness of response was increased in both groups following the spring series, as compared to the fall series, and generally the greatest relative gains occurred at the junior high level.

PSRS Responses by District

Table 2-M through 2-Q reflect teacher responses to their participation in teacher group counseling by district. Responses to Series 1 and Series 2 are shown separately. It should be remembered that Districts D and E are actually subdistricts within the same large urban school district. It should also be borne in mind that District D is in an area comprised in the majority by minority ethnic groups and lower socioeconomic groups. About 60% of the responses in District A come from junior high school teachers, the balance from elementary teachers. In the remaining districts, all responses are from elementary school teachers.

Inspection of Table 2-M reveals some gross differences among the participanting districts in response to the question of whether group discussions have been helpful (Item 1). District B clearly has a higher proportion of positive responses than any other district; while District C clearly has a higher proportion of less favorable responses than any other district. In the latter case, the small response n creates some cause for caution in interpreting outcomes, but the major trend away from a positive and toward a negative response cannot be ignored in this district. It is interesting to note that District D, located in a deprived area, received more favorable responses from teachers than every other district except B following the fall series.

There are some interesting shifts in response mode among districts following the spring series. Generally speaking, the shift is in a positive direction. This holds true for Districts A, B and E. District D, which was in a relatively favorable position following the fall series, actually declines in its proportion of positive response following the spring series, even though more teachers participated in the spring than in the fall.

Table 2-N reflects responses to Item 2. District B, which was the district in which teachers perceived participation in group counseling to have been most helpful, is now the district where the highest proportion of teachers perceive negative results to have eventuated from their participation in group work. District D, which was the district where the second highest proportion of teachers perceived group work as being helpful, is now the district which is second highest with the second most negative rating in this area. Generally speaking, all districts reflect, in overwhelming proportions, that negative results did not stem from participation in group discussion. Following Series 2, a familiar shift is seen toward a more negative response on this item in every district except District E.

Responses to Item 3 following the fall series reflect approximately the same pattern which held for Item 1. This data is reported in Table 2-O. Districts B and D have the highest proportion of positive response; while District C has the highest proportion of negative response. Following the spring series, there is a general positive shift in three of the four districts which held teacher groups. The other district (D) remains approximately the same.

Table 2-P reflects that teacher perceptions in all districts are to the effect that behavior changes in students following the first series, are for the better rather than the worse. Following the second series, responses are unanimous in this regard.

In spite of some negative responses in some districts, nearly all teachers indicate that they would recommend participation in a similar group to other teachers following Series 1; following Series 2, this verdict is unanimous. Table 2-Q reports these responses. It is interesting to note that in the district which had the most negative responses (C) all teachers who participated indicated they would recommend similar participation to fellow teachers. This, of course, raises serious questions as to the halo effect inherent in this item.

Intracorrelations of the Post Series Reaction Sheet

Table 2-R reflects intracorrelations obtained among the means of groups on the Post-Series Reaction Sheets. Two correlations, significant at the .01 level, were found. These existed between teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the groups and their perceptions of changes in children's behavior. The other significant correlation existed between teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the groups and their willingness to recommend participation in the group to other teachers.

Table 2-S reflects intracorrelations obtained on the PSRS when individual responses rather than group means were utilized. Three significant correlations were found, each of them significant at the .01 level. Item 1 was significantly correlated with Items 3 and 4. These results indicate significant relationships between teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the groups and their perception of whether or not behavior changes occurred, and their willingness to recommend participation in similar groups to their fellow teachers. In addition, there was a correlation between Item 3 and the willingness of teachers to recommend participation. This latter finding indicates the existence of a relationship between teacher perceptions of changes in children's behavior and their willingness to recommend participation in similar groups to their fellow teachers.

Table 2-T reports correlations among individual teacher responses for those teachers who participated in Series 2. Two significant correlations are found. In this case, the correlations are between Item 3 and Item 1 and Item 3 and Item 2. These relationships indicate that teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the groups and their perceptions of whether changes in children's behavior occurred are significantly related, and also that perception of behavior changes in children and perception of negative outcomes are negatively related.

TABLE 2-A

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Teacher Responses by Individuals

		N	Series 1	N	Series 2
Item 1	$\bar{X}$	154	3.422	46	3.978
	S.D.	154	.985	46	.896
Item 2	$\bar{X}$	155	4.767	47	4.617
	S.D.	155	.577	47	.813
Item 3	$\bar{X}$	153	2.326	46	3.086
	S.D.	153	.975	46	.996
Item 3a	$\bar{X}$	49	1.061	28	1.035
	S.D.	49	.239	28	.185
Item 4	$\bar{X}$	152	1.032	47	1.000
	S.D.	152	.178	47	.000

TABLE 2-B

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Teacher Responses by Groups

		N	Series 1	N	Series 2
Item 1	$\bar{X}$	23	3.484	7	4.094
	S.D.	23	.612	7	.460
Item 2	$\bar{X}$	23	4.799	7	4.633
	S.D.	23	.237	7	.383
Item 3	$\bar{X}$	23	2.370	7	3.177
	S.D.	23	.629	7	.655
Item 3a	$\bar{X}$	19	1.075	7	1.047
	S.D.	19	.228	7	.116
Item 4	$\bar{X}$	23	1.029	7	1.000
	S.D.	23	.093	7	.000

TABLE 2-C

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Teacher Group Discussion
Series 1

Question 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Age	Responses	Not At All				Very Much So
		1	2	3	4	5
20-29	50	2.0%	6.0%	36.0%	46.0%	10.0%
30-39	36	2.8	16.7	44.4	27.8	8.3
40-49	28	7.1	10.7	39.3	32.1	10.7
50-59	16	.0	31.3	25.0	31.3	12.5

Years of Experience in Education	Responses	Not At All				Very Much So
		1	2	3	4	5
0-9	97	2.1	12.4	38.1	39.2	8.2
10-19	28	7.1	10.7	39.3	28.6	14.3
20-29	7	.0	28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3

Years at Particular School	Responses	Not At All				Very Much So
		1	2	3	4	5
0-4	99	2.0	13.1	36.1	38.4	10.1
5-9	20	5.6	10.0	35.0	40.0	10.0
10-19	12	8.3	16.7	58.3	8.3	8.3

TABLE 2-D

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teacher Group Discussion

Series 1

Question 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

Age	Responses	Very Much So 1	2	3	4	Not At All 5
20-29	50	2.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	88.0%
30-39	37	.0	2.7	2.7	8.1	86.5
40-49	28	.0	.0	3.6	25.0	71.4
50-59	16	.0	.0	.0	18.8	81.3

Years of Experience in Education	Responses	Very Much So 1	2	3	4	Not At All 5
0-9	98	1.0	1.0	1.0	11.2	85.7
10-19	28	7.1	10.7	39.3	28.6	14.3
20-29	7	.0	.0	.0	28.6	71.4

Years at Particular School	Responses	Very Much So				Not At All
0-4	101	1.0	1.0	1.0	12.9	84.2
5-9	20	.0	.0	.0	15.0	85.0
10-19	12	.0	.0	8.3	16.7	75.0

TABLE 2-E

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Teacher Group Discussion
Series 1

Question 3: Have there been any recent changes in your pupil's behavior in class or other social situations?

Age	Responses	Not At All				Very Much So
		1	2	3	4	5
20-29	49	14.3%	53.1%	18.4%	12.2%	2.0%
30-39	37	32.4	29.7	24.3	10.8	2.7
40-49	28	17.9	53.6	10.7	14.3	3.6
50-59	16	18.8	43.8	18.8	18.8	.0

Years of Experience in Education	Responses	Not At All				Very Much So
		1	2	3	4	5
0-9	97	21.6	44.3	17.5	13.4	3.1
10-19	29	17.2	48.3	24.1	10.3	.0
20-29	7	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	.0

Years at Particular School	Responses	Not At All				Very Much So
0-4	100	18.0	47.0	20.0	13.0	2.0
5-9	20	25.0	50.0	5.0	15.0	5.0
10-19	12	33.3	25.0	33.3	8.3	.0

TABLE 2-F

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teacher Group Discussion
Series 1

Question 3a: If so, have these changes been for the better or worse?

Age	Responses	Better	Worse
20-29	17	100.0%	.0%
30-39	12	100.0	.0
40-49	6	83.3	16.7
50-59	5	80.0	20.0

Years of Experience in Education	Responses	Better	Worse
0-9	32	96.9	3.1
10-19	7	85.7	14.3
20-29	2	100.0	.0

Years at Particular School	Responses	Better	Worse
0-4	33	93.9	6.1
5-9	5	100.0	.0
10-19	3	100.0	.0

TABLE 2-G

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teacher Group Discussion

Series 1

Question 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers who have pupils with academic problems?

Age	Responses	Yes	No
20-29	49	98.0%	2.0%
30-39	37	86.5	13.5
40-49	28	92.9	7.1
50-59	16	92.9	7.1

Years of Experience in Education	Responses	Yes	No
0-9	96	93.8	6.2
10-19	29	89.7	10.3
20-29	6	100.0	.0

Years at Particular School	Responses	Yes	No
0-4	99	93.9	6.1
5-9	20	90.0	10.0
10-19	11	90.9	9.1

TABLE 2-H

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Series 1

Level	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
Elementary	125	2.4	13.6	37.6	29.6	16.8
Junior High	29	3.4	13.8	37.9	37.9	6.9

Series 2

Level	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
Elementary	31	0.0	3.2	29.0	32.3	35.5
Junior High	9	0.0	11.1	11.1	55.6	22.2

TABLE 2-I

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 2: Have there been any bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

Series 1

Level	Responses Counted	Very Much So 1	2	3	4	Not At All 5
Elementary	126	.8	.8	2.4	15.9	80.2
Junior High	29	.0	.0	.0	10.3	89.7

Series 2

Level	Responses Counted	Very Much So 1	2	3	4	Not At All 5
Elementary	31	3.2	.0	3.2	33.6	71.0
Junior High	9	.0	11.1	.0	22.2	66.7

TABLE 2-J

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 3: Have there been any recent changes in your pupils' behavior in class and other school situations?

Series 1

Level	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
Elementary	124	15.3%	44.4%	23.4%	14.5%	2.4%
Junior High	29	34.5	48.3	17.2	.0	.0

Series 2

Level	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
Elementary	31	6.5	9.7	48.4	25.8	9.7
Junior High	8	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5	.0

TABLE 2-K

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for the better or worse?

Series 1

Level	Responses Counted	Better	Worse
Elementary	45	95.6%	4.4%
Junior High	4	75.0	25.0

Series 2

Level	Responses Counted	Better	Worse
Elementary	23	100.0	.0
Junior High	2	100.0	.0

TABLE 2-L

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers who have pupils with academic problems?

Series 1

Level	Responses Counted	Yes	No
Elementary	123	95.9	4.1
Junior High	29	100.0	.0

Series 2

Level	Responses Counted	Yes	No
Elementary	31	100.0	.0
Junior High	9	100.0	.0

TABLE 2-M

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Series 1

District	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
A	51	3.9%	19.6%	39.2%	31.4%	5.9%
B	25	.0	4.0	20.0	32.0	44.0
C	7	.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	.0
D	11	.0	9.1	45.5	27.3	18.2
E	60	3.3	11.7	40.0	33.3	11.7

Series 2

District	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
A	12	.0	8.3	16.7	50.0	25.0
B	11	.0	.0	9.1	45.5	45.5
C	0					
D	12	.0	8.3	58.3	16.7	16.7
E	5	.0	.0	.0	40.0	60.0

TABLE 2-N

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

Series 1

District	Responses Counted	Very Much So 1	2	3	4	Not At All 5
A	51	.0%	.0%	2.0%	13.7%	84.3%
B	25	4.0	4.0	4.0	20.0	68.0
C	7	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0
D	11	.0	.0	9.1	18.2	72.7
E	61	.0	.0	.0	14.8	85.2

Series 2

District	Responses Counted	Very Much So 1	2	3	4	Not At All 5
A	12	.0	8.3	.0	16.7	75.0
B	11	9.1	.0	.0	36.4	54.5
C	0					
D	12	.0	.0	8.3	25.0	66.7
E	5	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0

TABLE 2-0

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 3: Have there been any recent changes in your pupils' behavior in class and other school situations?

Series 1

District	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
A	51	35.3%	43.1%	17.6%	2.0%	2.0%
B	24	4.2	37.5	33.3	25.0	.0
C	7	57.1	42.9	.0	.0	.0
D	11	.0	45.5	27.3	18.2	9.1
E	60	10.0	50.0	23.3	15.0	1.7

Series 2

District	Responses Counted	Not At All 1	2	3	4	Very Much So 5
A	11	18.2	36.4	36.4	9.1	.0
B	11	.0	.0	54.5	27.3	18.2
C	0					
D	12	8.3	25.0	41.7	25.0	0.0
E	5	.0	.0	40.0	40.0	20.0

TABLE 2-P

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for the better or worse?

Series 1

District	Responses Counted	Better	Worse
A	8	87.5%	12.5%
B	14	92.9	7.1
C	0		
D	4	100.0	.0
E	23	95.7	4.3

Series 2

District	Responses Counted	Better	Worse
A	4	100.0	.0
B	10	100.0	.0
C	0		
D	7	100.0	.0
E	4	100.0	.0

TABLE 2-Q

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Teachers' Responses to Group Counseling

Question 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers who have pupils with academic problems?

Series 1

District	Responses Counted	Yes	No
A	51	96.1%	3.9%
B	26	100.0	.0
C	7	100.0	.0
D	11	100.0	.0
E	57	94.7	5.3

Series 2

District	Responses Counted	Yes	No
A	12	100.0	.0
B	11	100.0	.0
C	0		
D	12	100.0	.0
E	5	100.0	.0

TABLE 2-R

Post-Series Reaction Sheet

Intracorrelations Between Post-Series Reaction Sheet Items by Group Means

Series 1

Items		1	2	3	3a	4
1	$\bar{X}$	1.000				
	N	23				
2	$\bar{X}$	-.215	1.000			
	N	23	23			
3	$\bar{X}$	.548**	-.329	1.000		
	N	23	23	23		
3a	$\bar{X}$	.030	.145	-.258	1.000	
	N	19	19	19	19	
4	$\bar{X}$	-.546**	-.148	-.017	-.112	1.000
	N	23	23	23	19	23

** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 2-S

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Reactions to Group Counseling
by Individual Teachers

Series 1

Item		1	2	3	3a	4
1	$\overline{X}$	1.000				
	N	154				
2	$\overline{X}$	.055	1.000			
	N	153	155			
3	$\overline{X}$	.393**	-.085	1.000		
	N	151	152	153		
3a	$\overline{X}$	-.197	-.036	-.021	1.000	
	N	47	48	49	49	
4	$\overline{X}$	-.351**	-.051	-.218**	0.000	1.000
	N	151	151	149	48	152

TABLE 2-T

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Reactions to Group Counseling
by Individual Teachers

Series 2

Item		1	2	3	3a	4
1	$\overline{X}$	1.000				
	N	46				
2	$\overline{X}$	-.159	1.000			
	N	46	47			
3	$\overline{X}$	.423**	-.304*	1.000		
	N	45	46	4[illegible]		
3a	$\overline{X}$	0.000	.105	.132	1.000	
	N	27	28	28	28	
4	$\overline{X}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Chapter 3

Counselor Reactions to Teacher Group Counseling

The data to be reported in this chapter reflect the subjective reactions of counselors to their experience in teacher group counseling. The copy of the complete instrument utilized for this purpose appears in Appendix B. Six of the seven items on the questionnaire can be answered objectively. The seventh requires a subjective response on the part of the counselor. Only the first six items will be reported on here.

Table 3-A reports the proportion of respondents who answered in each of the categories of the six items. Both Series 1 and Series 2 responses are included; however, the response total is so low in the spring (6) that these outcomes must be treated with caution. Responses to Item 1 are highly positive both fall and spring. The range of responses is more restricted in spring, and the move is in a positive direction.

Counselors report considerable interaction among teachers in the group. This result is reflected in Item 2. Again, there is a more restricted range of response in the spring, with a move toward the positive end of the scale.

Item 3 reflects counselor responses to the amount of hostility expressed in the group. It is most interesting to note that the fall to spring shift in this instance is toward what would normally be interpreted the negative end of the scale. No counselors reported a complete absence of hostility, and significant proportions reported either quite a bit or a great deal of hostility.

Item 4 indicates the prime direction of hostility. In the fall it is primarily towards both parents and pupils. In the spring, however, a higher proportion of hostility is directed toward self. A similar kind of shift was noted when dealing with parents. Parents who participated in one series of group counseling meetings tended to direct their hostility toward teachers. Those who participated in a second series tended to direct their hostility toward their own children. The shift is similar in that in both instances hostility appears to be directed more toward individuals or groups which are psychologically removed from the participant at the outset. Continued participation results in the direction of hostility more toward targets which are psychologically closer to the participants.

The responses to Item 5 indicate that counselors experience little difficulty as a result of participant insistence on a lecture approach to the group situation during the fall session. The few counselors who responded following the spring series indicated more difficulty along these lines. The counselor perception that there was little or no insistence on a lecture approach is interpreted as a significant response in that one of the major concerns expressed by the counselors prior to undertaking parent and teacher group counseling was that their expectation would be for a didactic situation and that it might be difficult or impossible to change this set. Apparently, this is not the case, and either the set did not exist to begin with or else was overcome.

Responses to Question 6 indicate that counselor perceptions of group outcomes varied from fair to excellent following both Series 1 and Series 2 teacher groups, although the group counselors were more cautious in response to this item than in response to other items on the scale. Counselor perceptions of outcomes were slightly more positive following the first series than they were following the second series. This finding is clearly in line with responses to other items on the CRSG.

It appears that counselors feel quite positively about certain aspects of group counseling ordinarily considered important. These would include rapport, interaction and freedom from insistence on a didactic approach. On the other hand, they are somewhat cautious in generalizing about group outcomes and report moderate amounts of hostility which appear to increase as participation in the group increases. It should be pointed out in this latter connection, however, that counselors also perceive the direction of hostility to shift from persons psychologically distant to targets closer to the participant.

Table 3-B reports the intracorrelations for the CRSG. Only three significant correlations are evident. All of these involve the relationship of Item 1 with other items on the scale. One of these relationships indicates a relationship significant at the .05 level between the counselor's perception of rapport in the groups and the amount of interaction which occurred. The other significant correlation indicates a relationship significant at the .01 level between perceptions of rapport and counselor feelings about group outcomes. A third relationship significant at the .10 level is the negative relationship between counselor perceptions of rapport and their perceptions of whether or not the group insisted on a lecture approach.

It would appear that the concept of rapport has some rather widespread general meaning for these counselors, and that the existence or nonexistence of rapport in the eyes of the counselors is a powerful determinant in their perception of whether or not other conditions existing within a specific group are favorable or unfavorable. It is interesting to note that the concept of hostility was not significantly related to any other variable included in this study.

TABLE 3-A

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups by Percentages

Question 1: How would you describe rapport in this group?

	No. of Groups	Poor	Not So Good	Fair	Very Good	Excellent
Series 1	22	.0	4.54	4.54	59.1	39.1
Series 2	6	.0	.0	10.6	33.3	50.0

Question 2: How much interaction was there among teachers in this group?

	No. of Groups	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
Series 1	22	.0	.0	13.65	45.45	40.90
Series 2	6	.0	.0	.0	50.0	50.0

Question 3: How much hostility was expressed in this group?

	No. of Groups	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
Series 1	21	.0	42.85	33.33	23.80	.0
Series 2	6	.0	16.6	33.33	33.33	16.6

Question 4: (Answered only if answer to above question was 3, 4 or 5)
Was this hostility directed primarily towards

	No. of Groups	Self	Counselor	Parents	Own Pupils	Other Group Members
Series 1	13	7.7	.0	38.46	38.46	15.38
Series 2	5	40.0	.0	20.0	20.0	20.0

Question 5: Did the group seem to insist that you talk or lecture to them?

	No. of Groups	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
Series 1	21	33.33	57.14	4.76	4.76	.0
Series 2	6	16.66	50.0	33.33	.0	.0

Question 6: What is your feeling about outcomes in this group?

	No. of Groups	Poor	Not So Good	Fair	Very Good	Excellent
Series 1	21	.0	.0	38.09	47.61	14.28
Series 2	6	.0	.0	50.0	16.66	33.33

TABLE 3-B

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups Intracorrelations Between CRSG Items by Group Means

Item		1 Rapport	2 Amount of Interaction	3 Amount of Hostility	5 Insistence on Lecture	6 Feelings Re Outcomes
1	$\overline{X}$	1.000				
	N	22				
2	$\overline{X}$	.454**	1.000			
	N	22	22			
3	$\overline{X}$	-.036	.031	1.000		
	N	21	21	21		
5	$\overline{X}$	-.406*	-.290	.286	1.000	
	N	21	21	21	21	
6	$\overline{X}$	.561***	.325	.113	-.090	1.000
	N	21	21	21	21	21

* Significant at .10 level.
** Significant at .05 level.
*** Significant at .01 level.

Chapter 4

Relationships between Teacher and Counselor Perceptions

Study of the intercorrelations between the Post-Series Reaction Sheet and the Counselor Responses to Specific Groups can provide a basis for understanding the extent to which counselor and teacher perceptions of their mutual experience in group counseling are related. These results are reported in Tables 4-A through 4-D.

Table 4-A reports the results of intercorrelations between the PSRS and CRSG following Series 1. The unit of analysis for Table 4-A is the individual participating teacher. Ten significant correlations exist in this matrix. Four of them involve Item 1 of the PSRS, four involve Item 4 of the PSRS and two involve Item 3 of the PSRS. It would thus seem that teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the group discussions and their willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers are the two teacher percepts which relate most highly to counselor percepts. The two correlations associated with Item 3 of the PSRS indicate that this item also has some power to predict counselor response. This item is related to teacher perceptions of recent changes in the behavior of children in their classes.

Item 1 of the PSRS is correlated significantly with Items 1, 5 and 6 of the CRSG at the .01 level. It is also correlated with Item 2 of the CRSG at the .05 level. The existence of these relationships indicates reliable relationships between teacher feelings that the group discussions had been helpful to them and counselor perceptions of group rapport, group interaction, group insistence on a lecture approach (negative relationship) and counselor feelings about outcomes. The perception of the "helpfulness" of the group is highly related to four of the five counselor responses.

Item 3 of the PSRS significantly related to Items 3 and 6 of the CRSG at the .05 level of confidence. These findings indicate a stable relationship between teacher perceptions of behavior change in children and counselor perceptions of the amount of hostility expressed in the group (negative relationship) and counselor feelings about group outcomes.

Item 4 of the PSRS is significantly correlated with Items 1, 2 and 5 of the CRSG at the .01 level. It is significantly correlated with Item 6 of the CRSG at the .05 level. These findings indicate a stable relationship between teacher willingness to recommend participation in the groups to other teachers and counselor perceptions of rapport, group interaction, group insistence on a lecture approach (negative relation) and counselor feelings about group outcomes.

It is probably important to note that teacher perceptions of bad or negative outcomes from their participation in the group and teacher perceptions of whether behavior changes in children had been for the better or worse did not correlate with any counselor responses. This result can best be accounted for by the extremely limited range of response of teachers to these two items. It should also be noted in the same connection that counselor perceptions of hostility in the group correlated significantly with only one other variable at a relatively low level. This result cannot be accounted for by a restricted response range, and it may indicate that the concept "hostility" has little utility in describing group functioning.

Table 4-B reports intercorrelations between the PSRS and CRSG following Series 2. Only three significant correlations are found in this matrix. This shift from ten to three significant correlations can be accounted for in part by the reduction of response n and the fact that all participants in Series 2 would recommend participation to other teachers, thus reducing variance on this item to zero. All of the three significant correlations following Series 2 exist between items which were significantly correlated following Series 1. These are between Item 1 of the PSRS and Items 1 and 6 of the CRSG related at the .05 and .01 levels respectively, and between Item 6 of the CRSG and Item 3 of the PSRS at the .01 level. The first two of these correlations would indicate a significant relationship between counselor perceptions of rapport and general feeling about outcomes and teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the groups. The second indicates a relationship between counselor feelings about group outcomes and teacher perceptions of behavior change in their pupils.

The significant correlations revealed in these tables indicate what appear to be meaningful and logical relationships between teacher and counselor perceptions of their mutual counseling experiences. These correlations tend to support the idea that there is a similarity of perception of this mutual experience on the part of both parties. Where the counselors are cautious, the teachers appear to be cautious. Where one group has reservations, the other also indicates reservations and where counselors are enthusiastic, teachers tend to be enthusiastic. Concepts of interaction, rapport and group outcome appear to relate well to the nature of the response to be expected from group participants. The concept hostility does not tend to predict the responses of participants with great accuracy. However, following Series 2, there is a .10 level of significance relationship between counselors perceptions of the amount of hostility exhibited by the group and the group's perception of their pupils' behavior change being for the better or worse. The more hostility expressed in the group, the more pupil behavior was reported as changing for the worse. Further examination of the predictive value of these process variables appears to be warranted.

TABLE 4-A

Intracorrelations Between PSRS and CRSG Items by Individual Teachers

Series 1

CRSG		Post-Series Reaction Sheet Items				
Item		1	2	3	3a	4
1	$\bar{X}$	.400**	-.046	.160	.142	-.325**
	N	142	143	142	44	140
2	$\bar{X}$	.187*	-.045	-.004	.134	-.234**
	N	142	143	142	44	140
3	$\bar{X}$	-.046	.062	-.190	.191	.092
	N	139	140	139	41	137
5	$\bar{X}$	-.234**	.091	-.104	-.040	.324**
	N	135	135	134	38	132
6	$\bar{X}$	.278**	.072	.164*	.214	-.219*
	N	135	135	134	38	132

TABLE 4-B

Intracorrelations Between PSRS and CRSG Items by Individual Teachers

Series 2

CRSG		Post-Series Reaction Sheet Items				
Item		1	2	3	3a	4
1	$\bar{X}$	.328*	-.065	.228	.219	No variance on this item as all participants were positive.
	N	41	41	41	23	
2	$\bar{X}$	-.167	-.140	-.035	.155	
	N	41	41	41	23	
3	$\bar{X}$	.115	-.056	-.169	.386	
	N	41	41	41	23	
5	$\bar{X}$	.191	-.125	.179	.284	
	N	41	41	41	23	
6	$\bar{X}$	.454**	.205	.427**	-.189	
	N	41	41	41	23	

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

Chapter 5

Teacher Attendance and Related Variables

One criterion of counseling success is the extent to which attendance is maintained throughout the five group meetings of each series. It should be reemphasized at this juncture that teacher attendance at these meetings was purely voluntary and that no credit of any kind accrued to them from their participation in the group. The sole incentive for group participation was the extent to which those who participated derived individual satisfaction from their participation. Thus, it was easy for them to give up this time-consuming activity if it became apparent that it would not meet their professional or personal needs. In this instance then, attendance at the group meetings is a sensitive indicator of teacher interest and may be assumed to be one valid criterion of group success, at least from the point of view of the participants.

If the above assumption is correct, then there should be some significant relationships between attendance patterns and the perceptions which teachers and counselors have of the group experience. Correlations between these kinds of variables will reveal the nature of these relationships.

Table 5-Aprovides a general view of the attendance picture within the groups. Among the participating schools the average school had approximately 24 teachers, approximately nine of whom participated in the groups during Series 1 and seven during Series 2.

A teacher was considered a "participant" if he attended only one meeting. A "non-participant" was a teacher who attended no meetings at all. Table 5-A indicates that the average number of meetings attended by participants was 3.5 during Series 1 and slightly higher than this during Series 2.

Table 5-A indicates that the mean number of teachers who attended Meeting 1 of Series 1 was 8.5, while the mean number who attended the last meeting of Series 1 was 6.4, a reduction of approximately 25%. The number of teachers who attended Meeting 1 of Series 2 was slightly over 6. The number who attended the last meeting of Series 2 was slightly higher than the number who attended the first meeting. It would appear that the holding power of the second series was considerably higher than that of the first series. This might be accounted for in part by the fact that over 75% of the teachers who participated in Series 2 had previously participated in Series 1, and thus knew what they were getting into.

The definition of participant which was used made it possible to see if the groups actually picked up new members after the first meeting. The Series 1 groups gained 15% after the first meeting and the Series 2 groups gained 23% after the first meeting.

The percent at each meeting reported in Table 5-B reflects this data and provides a slightly different way of viewing the attendance patterns. It indicates the percentage of participants who attended any one of the five meetings for both Series 1 and Series 2. Viewing the figures for Series 1, it can be seen that there is a steady diminution in proportion of participants who attended each meeting from No. 1 through No. 4, but that there is a slight upward trend during the fifth meeting. The same data for Series 2 are quite different. During Series 2 attendance tended to hold up well throughout the entire series and to actually increase at the final session. This finding may say something about teacher perceptions of the perceived value of the groups during Series 2. Whether it is due to the selectivity which occurred during Series 2 or to the increased experience of the teacher group counselors is not possible to say on the basis of available data.

Table 5-C provides still a different outlook on the same data. It indicates the percent of participants who attended a given number of meetings out of the five for both Series 1 and Series 2, and further breaks this data down by level. During Series 1, it can be seen that a majority of participants attended at least four out of five meetings at both the elementary and junior high level. The junior high level exceeds the elementary level in this regard. The data for Series 2 involve considerably reduced n's, but the junior high group now exceeds the elementary group by a very considerable proportion in terms of attendance at the group sessions. It should also be pointed out that attendance at the elementary level is also considerably better, except in terms of the proportion of teachers who attended five out of five meetings, which was reduced by one-third. The counselors subjective reaction to this latter finding was to the effect that many more demands are made on teachers for their time during the spring than during the fall, and that the proportion of those who attended as many as four out of five sessions was probably a better indicator of interest in the group than the criterion of attendance at five out of five meetings.

Table 5-D reports the same data by district. Some wide variations among districts are seen both during Series 1 and Series 2. The district in which the proportion of attendance at meetings was highest overall was District A, with 70% of teachers attending at least four out of five meetings. The district with the poorest attendance record was District C, with 50% attending only two meetings or less.

During Series 2, District C, which had the poorest proportion of attendance during Series 1, had no teacher groups. District A again had the highest proportion of attendance at most meetings. It should be mentioned that District D held only four meetings during both Series 1 and Series 2, and if this is taken into account then the attendance record at District D is better than any other district both during Series 1 and Series 2.

The data do not indicate the reasons for differences in proportion of attendance at group meetings among districts. Future data analysis will enable study of this variable

Intracorrelation of Attendance Variables

Another way of examining attendance data is to study the relationship between attendance at one meeting and attendance at other meetings in the same series. Table 5-E reports this data for Series 1. Study of the table indicates that attendance at Meetings 4 and 5 is significantly related to attendance at all other meetings, but that low intracorrelations among attendance at the first three meetings reveal highly unstable attendance patterns during these meetings. The total number of meetings attended correlates highly with attendance at every meeting from one through five, and the magnitude of these correlations is an increasing one, as one would expect from such dependently related variables.

Table 5-F reports identical data for Series 2. The general pattern of significant correlations is the same. A counselor cannot begin to estimate individual attendance at a later meeting until the third session.

Relationship of Attendance to Demographic Variables

Still another way of studying attendance variables in voluntary teacher groups is to ask the question, "Who participated and to what extent did they participate?" Do teacher counseling groups elicit participation from particular segments of the teaching population with respect to age, years of experience in education or years at a particular school? If such participation is limited in any of these ways, availability of such data will enable the pupil personnel specialist to know in advance who is likely to be reached and who is likely not to be reached through utilization of this technique.

Table 5-G summarizes the data on age, years of experience in education and years of experience in the present school in relation to participation or non-participation and also in relation to degree of participation as revealed by attendance at each of the five sessions. The data summarized here are for Series 1 and are reported both in terms of absolute numbers and percentages.

Perusal of the upper section of Table 5-G dealing with age indicates a striking similarity at every age level with respect to the proportion of participants and non-participants. It would appear that age in and of itself has little or nothing to do with participation at the teacher group meetings.

It is also evident that the factor of age has little to do with attendance at any specific meeting of the group. The proportions of each age group which are in attendance at each of the five different meetings are approximately the same.

The center section of Table 5-G deals with relationships between years of experience in education and participation variables. This variable appears to have more predictive power for participation or non-participation than the age variable. It is quite clear that those with the least experience participated in highest proportion and those with the most experience participated least in the group sessions. The proportion of attendance among these three experience groups remains approximately the same from the first session through the fifth session. The greatest absolute decline does occur in the least experienced group.

The lower section of Table 5-G uses the criterion of years at the present school as a yardstick against which to view participation, non-participation and degree of participation. In this instance, it appears that those with fewer years in the present school have a slightly higher tendency to participate in the groups than those with more years in their present school. It is somewhat to be doubted that this is a reliable finding in view of the relatively small difference. The proportion of attendance among those with varying years of experience in their present school at subsequent group meetings is quite small.

It would appear that while neither age nor years of experience at their present school is a determinant of who elects to participate or not to participate in voluntary teacher groups, that years of experience in education may be predictive of such participation. The tendency is for those with the least experience to participate most heavily and for those with the most experience to participate the least. It should be noted that of the total number of teachers who had an opportunity to participate in voluntary teacher group counseling, approximately 47% did in fact participate. This statistic taken by itself is a significant finding.

Interrelationships between Attendance and Responses to the PSRS

Table 5-H reports the correlations between PSRS responses and attendance variables. Only two items on the PSRS are related to any attendance variables. These are Item 1, dealing with the helpfulness of group discussions, and Item 4, which asks whether or not the participant would recommend similar participation to other teachers.

Item 1 is correlated with attendance at Meeting No. 3 and with attendance at Meeting No. 4. It is further correlated with the total number of meetings attended. It would thus appear that those who feel that the discussions have been helpful are also those who attended the most meetings.

Relationships exist between Item 4 and attendance at Meeting No. 3 and Meeting No. 5. This would indicate that those who attended these meetings were also those willing to recommend participation in teacher group counseling to their associates. Those who attended the most meetings are also those most willing to recommend similar participation to their associates.

These findings may, in addition to their obvious implications, also indicate that teachers responded frankly to the PSRS, since it is to be expected that those who would be least willing to say that the meetings were helpful and the least willing to recommend similar participation to their fellow teachers are those who attended the fewer number of meetings and who therefore are probably those most disenchanted with the whole procedure.

Table 5-I reports identical data for Series 2. The number of significant correlations in this matrix is larger than the number found in the preceding table. There is, however, no overlap in terms of significant correlations between the same two variables. On Table 5-I correlations significant at the .05 level are found between Item 1 of the PSRS and the number of teachers at the first meeting and the total number of teachers in the school. These findings would appear to indicate that attendance at the first meeting of the second series was indicative of perceived helpfulness of the groups and may be attributable to the fact that about 75% of the teachers who attended Series 2 had also attended Series 1. The relationship between the number of teachers in the school is such that the smaller the school, the more helpful the teachers felt the discussions to have been. There is also a relationship significant at the .05 level between attendance at Meeting No. 4 and teachers reporting a lack of negative results from participation in group discussions.

A correlation significant at the .05 level exists between the total number of teachers in each participating school and teacher perceptions of recent changes in the behavior of children in their classes. In this case, the relationship is such that the smaller the school is, the more such changes were noticed by the participating teachers.

Relationships of significance also exist between teachers reporting that changes in their pupils have been for the better and attendance at Meetings 2 and 5, with the attendance at Meeting 5 being perfectly correlated with perceived pupil changes for the better.

A relationship significant at the .01 level of confidence exists between the total number of meetings attended by participants and teacher perceptions of whether or not behavior changes in children were for the better or the worse. The more meetings attended by teachers, the more were such changes perceived to be positive rather than negative.

It is difficult to explain the shift in significant correlations from Series 1 to Series 2. It is obvious that the relationship between attendance variables and perceptions of the group experience change dramatically from Series 1 to Series 2. The most obvious factor in this situation appears to be the increased experience of teacher participants in group discussions. Such increased participation appears to alter the perceptions and expectations of individuals in the group.

Attendance and Counselor Responses on the CRSG

Table 5-J reports the relationship between counselor responses to their group experience and teacher attendance variables for Series 1 and Series 2, respectively. The percent of the group attending each meeting was used as the score for the correlations with the CRSG. Four correlations significant at the .10 level and two significant at the .05 level were revealed following Series 1.

There is a significant negative relationship between attendance at the first two group counseling sessions and Item 2 of the CRSG. This finding indicates a relationship between counselor perceptions of interaction among teachers in the group decreasing as the number who attended these two sessions increases. There is also a relationship between attendance at Meeting No. 3 and counselor feelings about group outcomes. The higher the attendance at this session, the more favorably counselors perceived outcomes.

There was a relationship between two CRSG variables and the actual number attending the first meeting. These variables included No. 1, dealing with rapport, and variable No. 2, dealing with interaction. In each case, the larger the number attending Meeting No. 1, the more negatively did counselors respond. A correlation exists between Item No. 1 of the CRSG and the total number of teachers who attended all five of the sessions in the same fashion. This relationship indicates that the higher this number, then the more negatively the counselor described the rapport that existed. The counselors seemed to have trouble establishing rapport and interaction if more than eight teachers attended the first two meetings.

In no instance is Item 5, dealing with group insistence on a lecture approach, significantly correlated with an attendance variable, and the same holds true for Item 3, dealing with counselor perceptions of hostility being unrelated to an attendance variable. As has been true consistently, counselor perceptions of rapport, interaction and outcomes tend to be related to certain attendance variables, while counselor perceptions of hostility or insistence on a lecture approach are not generally predictive of any teacher behavior related to attendance at the groups.

TABLE 5-A

Teacher Group Counseling Attendance by Individual Teachers

		N	Series 1	N	Series 2
Total in School	$\bar{X}$	223	24.408		
	S.D.	223	9.126		
Number in Groups	$\bar{X}$	24	9.375	8	7.625
	S.D.	24	2.796	8	2.175
Total Groups Attended	$\bar{X}$	212	3.518	66	3.651
	S.D.	212	1.364	66	1.174
N at First Meeting	$\bar{X}$	213	8.525	66	6.151
	S.D.	213	2.382	66	2.343
N at Last Meeting	$\bar{X}$	213	6.427	66	6.318
	S.D.	213	2.457	66	2.082

TABLE 5-B

Teacher Group Counseling Attendance at Individual Meetings

		N	Series 1	N	Series 2
% at 1st Meeting	$\bar{X}$	213	85.4	66	77.2
	S.D.	213	3.52	66	4.19
% at 2nd Meeting	$\bar{X}$	213	77.9	66	71.2
	S.D.	213	4.14	66	4.52
% at 3rd Meeting	$\bar{X}$	213	66.6	66	78.7
	S.D.	213	4.71	66	4.08
% at 4th Meeting	$\bar{X}$	213	61.0	66	71.2
	S.D.	213	4.87	66	4.52
% at 5th Meeting	$\bar{X}$	201	64.1	54	81.4
	S.D.	201	4.79	54	3.88

TABLE 5-C

Percent of Teachers Attending Various Numbers of Meetings

Series 1

Level	N	% Att. One Only	% Att. 2 of 5	% Att. 3 of 5	% Att. 4 of 5	% Att. 5 of 5
Elementary	175	9.71	17.14	16.57	25.71	30.85
Junior High	38	13.15	18.42	5.26	26.31	36.84

Series 2

Level	N	% Att. One Only	% Att. 2 of 5	% Att. 3 of 5	% Att. 4 of 5	% Att. 5 of 5
Elementary	45	2.22	6.66	26.66	44.44	20.00
Junior High	9	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.44	55.55

TABLE 5-D

Percent of Teachers Attending Various Numbers of Meetings

Series 1

District	N	% Att. One Only	% Att. 2 of 5	% Att. 3 of 5	% Att. 4 of 5	% Att. 5 of 5
A	60	8.33	16.66	5.00	25.00	45.00
B	46	13.04	15.21	17.39	28.26	26.08
C	10	10.00	40.00	10.00	30.00	10.00
D	12	0.00	8.33	41.66	50.00	*
E	85	11.76	17.64	16.47	21.17	32.94

Series 2

District	N	% Att. One Only	% Att. 2 of 5	% Att. 3 of 5	% Att. 4 of 5	% Att. 5 of 5
A	12	0.00	0.00	8.33	41.66	50.00
B	24	0.00	8.33	12.50	54.16	25.00
C	--	--	--	--	--	--
D	12	0.00	0.00	58.33	41.66	*
E	6	16.66	16.66	16.66	16.66	33.33

* Only four meetings held

TABLE 5-E

Intracorrelations between Attendance at Meetings by Individual Teachers

Series 1

		1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	$\bar{X}$	1.000					
	N	213					
2	$\bar{X}$	.133	1.000				
	N	213	213				
3	$\bar{X}$	.075	.008	1.000			
	N	213	213	213			
4	$\bar{X}$	.188**	.155*	.333**	1.000		
	N	213	213	213	213		
5	$\bar{X}$	.211**	.141*	.424**	.549*	1.000	
	N	201	201	201	201	201	
Total Mtgs. Att.	$\bar{X}$	.460**	.452**	.612*	.743**	.780*	1.000
	N	212	213	213	212	200	212

TABLE 5-F

Intracorrelations between Attendance at Meetings by Individual Teachers

Series 2

		1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	$\bar{X}$	1.000					
	N	66					
2	$\bar{X}$	-.185	1.000				
	N	66	66				
3	$\bar{X}$	-.016	.161	1.000			
	N	66	66	66			
4	$\bar{X}$	.054	.113	.243*	1.000		
	N	66	66	66	66		
5	$\bar{X}$	.177	.471**	.261*	.449**	1.000	
	N	54	54	54	54	54	
Total Mtgs. Att.	$\bar{X}$	.331**	.495**	.508**	.666**	.788**	1.000
	N	66	66	66	66	54	66

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 5-G

Teacher Attendance Patterns
Series 1

Variable	Non-Part. N=220		Participant N=203		#1		#2		#3		#4		#5	
Age	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	#
20-29	72	33.8	66	33.2	52	34.7	54	38.0	41	36.3	37	33.6	33	31.1
30-39	57	26.8	58	29.1	45	30.0	41	28.9	31	27.4	27	24.5	32	30.2
40-49	45	21.1	47	23.6	32	21.3	31	21.8	26	23.0	31	28.2	25	23.6
50-59	33	15.5	24	12.1	20	13.3	15	10.6	13	11.5	13	11.8	15	14.2
60 or Over	6	2.8	4	2.0	1	.7	1	.7	2	1.8	2	1.8	1	.9
Total	213		199		150		142		113		110		106	
Years of Experience	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-9	128	59.5	136	68.0	110	72.4	108	75.0	83	72.2	77	70.0	77	71.3
10-19	55	25.6	47	23.5	31	20.4	26	18.1	23	20.0	26	23.6	25	23.1
20.29	21	9.8	17	8.5	11	7.2	10	6.9	9	7.8	7	6.4	6	5.6
30 or Over	11	5.1	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Total	215		200		152		144		115		110		108	
Years at Particular School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%%	No.	%
0-4	148	68.5	147	73.5	112	74.2	106	74.1	86	76.1	80	73.4	80	75.5
5-9	43	19.9	35	17.5	24	15.9	25	17.5	20	16.8	20	17.4	18	16.0
10-19	22	10.2	18	9.0	15	9.9	12	8.4	8	7.1	10	9.2	9	8.5
20 or Over	3	1.4	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Total	216		200		151		143		113		109		106	

TABLE 5-H

Intracorrelations between PSRS Items
and Teacher Attendance at Meetings
by Individual Teachers

Series 1

		Post-Series Reaction Sheet				
Attendance		1	2	3	3a	4
1	X̄	-.025	.057	.065	.076	.058
	N	154	155	153	49	152
2	X̄	.105	.063	-.041	.137	.004
	N	154	155	153	49	152
3	X̄	.173*	.018	.147	.137	-.244**
	N	154	155	153	49	152
4	X̄	.257**	.157	.127	-.039	-.141
	N	154	155	153	49	152
5	X̄	.133	.092	.098	-.131	-.181*
	N	143	144	142	45	141
Total Meetings Attended	X̄	.247**	.154	.107	.096	-.190*
	N	153	154	152	49	151
N at First Meeting	X̄	-.087	-.038	-.156	-.133	.043
	N	154	155	153	49	152
N at Last Meeting	X̄	-.012	.003	-.111	-.084	-.054
	N	154	155	153	49	152
Total Number in School	X̄	-.012	.113	-.050	.184	-.090
	N	154	155	153	49	152

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 5-I

Intracorrelations between PSRS Items and Teacher Attendance at Meetings by Individual Teachers

Series 2

		Post-Series Reaction Sheet				
Attendance		1	2	3	3a	4
1	$\bar{X}$	-.075	-.029	-.121	-.304	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
2	$\bar{X}$	.100	-.215	.101	-.412*	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
3	$\bar{X}$	-.153	-.101	-.160	.100	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
4	$\bar{X}$	.163	.295*	-.155	-.333	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
5	$\bar{X}$	.053	-.131	.156	-1.000**	0.000
	N	34	35	34	21	35
Total Meetings Attended	$\bar{X}$	.227	-.036	-.032	-.548**	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
N at First Meeting	$\bar{X}$	-.312*	-.019	-.198	.124	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
N at Last Meeting	$\bar{X}$	-.221	-.100	.243	.285	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47
Total Number in School	$\bar{X}$	-.366*	-.069	-.367*	.298	0.000
	N	46	47	46	28	47

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 5-J

Intracorrelations between CRSG Items and Teacher Attendance at Meetings by Group Means

Series 1

Attendance		Counselor Reactions to Specific Group				
		1	2	3	5	6
1	$\overline{X}$	-.071	-.410*	.056	.259	-.185
	N	22	22	21	21	21
2	$\overline{X}$	.028	-.401*	.052	.249	-.254
	N	22	22	21	21	21
3	$\overline{X}$	.294	.083	.289	-.206	.414*
	N	22	22	21	21	21
4	$\overline{X}$	.077	.031	.151	.087	.141
	N	22	22	21	21	21
5	$\overline{X}$	-.060	.144	.068	.103	-.126
	N	21	21	20	20	20
N at First Meeting	$\overline{X}$	-.447**	-.414*	-.064	.276	-.196
	N	22	22	21	21	21
N at Last Meeting	$\overline{X}$	-.337	-.028	-.041	.167	-.055
	N	22	22	21	21	21
Total Group	$\overline{X}$	-.464**	-.216	.137	.137	-.157
	N	22	22	21	21	21

*Significant at .10 level.
**Significant at .05 level.

Chapter 6

Summary

This chapter will summarize the findings which have been reported in the preceding chapters relative to teacher group counseling. The summary will include feasibility, teacher reactions to the counseling experience, counselor reactions to the counseling process and their general feelings about teacher group counseling as a guidance technique, relationships between teacher and counselor perceptions and patterns of teacher attendance at the counseling groups.

Feasibility

Teachers in participating schools were invited to be members in teacher counseling groups in 26 schools, and this attempt was successful in 20 schools. Teachers who participated represented a wide spectrum of age and experience. It was noted that participation was heaviest in those schools where the principal expressed, through a formal questionnaire, strong support of guidance activities in general. The amount of teacher response in conjunction with the consistency of attendance at teacher groups leads to the conclusion that teachers saw them as meeting their professional needs. The fact that these conditions were found to exist when the counselors utilized were comprised entirely of regular district personnel leads to the conclusion that teacher group counseling is entirely feasible in the typical school district.

Teacher Reactions

Teachers were invited to participate in teacher group counseling in the Fall of 1965. They were told the series would last for five meetings over a five-week period. In some schools a second series of meetings was held in the spring, also for five meetings. Teacher reaction to the experience in Series 1 was in a positive direction and became considerably more positive following Series 2. The teachers as a group reported that very few negative results had taken place from their group experience during either series. Most teachers did not perceive changes in their pupils' behavior following participation in Series 1; however, they reported considerable change following Series 2. When changes were reported in either Series 1 or Series 2, the pupils' changing behavior tended to be for the better. Following Series 1 the teachers overwhelmingly recommended participation in similar groups to their fellow teachers, and by Series 2 the recommendation for participation was unanimous.

The reactions to the groups by age, years of experience in education and years at the present school are also reported in the study. The younger teachers responded more positively to the group in terms of its helpfulness than did any other age group. This tends to hold true for both number of years in education and number of years at a particular school. There are few differences among the categories on the items reporting negative results or behavior change. Nearly all teachers, regardless of demographic category, reported behavior change in their pupils had been for the better, and approximately 90% of the teachers in all groups said they would recommend participation in a similar group to their fellow teachers. As reported previously, by Series 2 the response was 100% recommendation for participation.

When the teacher reactions are examined by academic level, the elementary teachers show a slight tendency to report the discussions as being more helpful than do the junior high teachers, although both are highly positive following both Series 1 and 2. Elementary teachers report slightly more negative results than do junior high school teachers following both Series 1 and Series 2. However, again both groups report very few negative results. Elementary teachers report considerably more behavior change in their pupils following both Series 1 and 2 and tend to report the direction of this change as being for the better, although very few junior high school teachers report in this category. There is no meaningful difference between the elementary and junior high school teachers on their willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers, as both groups are extremely positive.

Although it can generally be reported there are very positive reactions from the teachers to all these items, there are differences among the districts on the degree of favorableness, but these differences seem to be rather minor. Outcomes in all five districts were quite positive, and the feasibility of this approach did not seem to be affected by differences among the districts included in this study.

The correlations among the teacher reaction items (PSRS) showed that the perception of the group's helpfulness was strongly related to perceived behavior change in pupils and their willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers. It is quite interesting to note that teachers' perceptions of the helpfulness of the group was not significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of negative results. This phenomenon has been found to be true in the analysis of parent reactions, also (Shaw and Rector, 1968). The same pattern of correlations exists when the data are correlated by individual teachers rather than by groups. When the data are viewed in Series 2 for individual teachers the major change from Series 1 is that while behavior change is correlated with the teachers' perceptions of helpfulness, the direction of behavior change is correlated in such a fashion that lack of negative results is correlated with pupil change for the better. At the same time, the helpfulness of the group and the relative amount of negative results experienced remain uncorrelated.

Counselor Reactions

Counselors reported a high level of rapport and a considerable amount of interaction for both Series 1 and Series 2. A fair amount of hostility was expressed and was directed at parents and pupils during the fall series, but mainly towards oneself in the spring series. There was very little insistence by the teacher group that the counselor talk or lecture to them. Counselor feelings about outcomes for the specific group ranged from fair to excellent. In short, the counselors were quite positive about the rapport, interaction and freedom from insistence on a didactic approach during their groups; however, they were cautious in generalizing about specific group outcomes and reported moderate amounts of hostility.

The correlation matrix of the process variables to which the counselors responded shows significant relationships between rapport and interaction and general outcomes, and a significant negative correlation between rapport and insistence by the group on a lecture approach. Noting that rapport is the only variable correlated with any of the other variables, it seems that rapport has general widespread meaning as a concept for these counselors. It is pertinent to point out that the concept of hostility was not significantly related to any of the other process variables included in this study.

Relationships between Teacher and Counselor Perceptions

Ten significant correlations were found between parent and counselor responses to the Post-Series Reaction Sheet and the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups following Series 1, using the individual teacher as the unit of analysis. Counselor perceptions of rapport are significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the helpfulness of the group and their willingness to recommend participation to teachers in a similar group. The counselors' perceptions of interaction were also correlated with the teachers' perceptions of the helpfulness of the group and the teachers' willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers. With so little variance on the teacher response to recommendation of participation, it is striking to find a correlation of the magnitude to merit significance. Counselor perceptions of holtility in the group were negatively related to the perception of change in pupils on the part of the teachers. Counselor perceptions of the degree to which the group insisted on a didactic approach from the counselor was negatively related to the individual teacher's perception of the helpfulness of the group and was negatively related to willingness to recommend participation to a fellow teacher.

Counselors' general feelings about outcomes were correlated with the teachers' perceptions of helpfulness, perception of pupil behavior change and willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers. Following Series 2, the counselor perceptions of rapport were correlated with the teachers' feelings about the helpfulness of the group and the counselors' feelings about general outcomes are related to the teachers' feelings about the helpfulness of the group and the amount of behavior change in his pupils.

This data would seem to validate certain meaningful and logical relationships between teacher and public school counselor perceptions of the group counseling process. These mutual perceptions tend to support the idea there is a similarity of perception of this experience on the part of both parties. Concepts of rapport, interaction and group outcomes appear to relate well to the nature of the response to be expected from the group participants. The public school counselor can evaluate these process variables and determine the subjective reactions of his group with considerable accuracy.

Teacher Attendance

During Series 1, the size of the average group was nine teachers and during Series 2, the size of the average group was seven teachers. There was a tendency for the Series 1 groups to lose members, and there was a tendency for the Series 2 groups to gain members as the series progressed. During Series 1, the percent of the group present at Meeting 1 was a mean of 85%, and those present at Meeting 5 was a mean of 64% of the group members. The reverse trend was seen in the second series, with the groups averaging 77% attendance at the first meeting and 81% of the total group attending the fifth meeting. It is interesting to note that the average number of teachers attending the fifth meeting for Series 1 was 6.4 teachers, while the average number attending the fifth meeting for Series 2 was 6.3 teachers.

This might be an interesting statement about the relative size that a teacher group should be and from this data it seems the optimum would be six or seven.

Both elementary and junior high groups show more teachers attending five out of five meetings than any other combination of attendance patterns, such as four out of five, three out of five, two of five or one of five. A clear majority of the participants attended at least four out of the five meetings during both series and at both levels.

There were wide variations among districts in teacher attendance patterns, and the district with the poorest attendance pattern during Series 1 had no teacher groups during Series 2. The teacher groups seemed to be especially well attended in the districts where there were high proportions of culturally deprived minority students. The best attendance pattern was in the district that had the highest number of culturally deprived students. The district next highest in the patterns of attendance was the district with the next highest proportion of students who could be called culturally deprived.

A very interesting finding of the study was revealed in the patterns of intercorrelations between attendance at various meetings. Attendance at Meetings 1, 2 and 3 for both Series 1 and 2 are not correlated. This means that a counselor cannot predict from attendance at Meeting 1 whether or not a given person will be present at Meetings 2 or 3. Neither can he predict attendance at Meeting 3 from a teacher's attendance at Meeting 2. During Series 1, attendance at Meetings 4 and 5, however, was correlated with attendance at Meetings 1, 2 and 3, in increasing orders of magnitude. In Series 2, attendance at Meeting 1 was uncorrelated with any other attendance variable. Attendance at Meeting 2 was correlated only with attendance at Meeting 5. Attendance at Meeting 3 was correlated with attendance at Meetings 4 and 5, and attendance at Meeting 5 was correlated with attendance at Meeting 4. The total number of groups attended was correlated with attendance at Meetings 1 through 5 in increasing order of magnitude. Attendance at a following group meeting was not predictable from attendance at a current meeting until the third meeting of the counseling series had taken place in both Series 1 and Series 2. It is not possible to ascribe this finding to the fact that teachers did not know what they were getting into, as the pattern seems more clear in Series 2 than it does in Series 1.

The mere fact of attendance at the first two meetings of a group was no predictor of later attendance patterns, unless modified by the process variables reported by the counselor. There was a significant negative relationship between attendance at the first two group counseling sessions and the degree of interaction perceived by the counselor. This indicates that intensive interaction among teachers in Meetings 1 and 2 seems to be a predictor of lack of attendance for Meetings 2 and 3. However, participants tended to start coming back by Meetings 4 and 5. It could well be that interaction is preceding the development of group rapport in these initial sessions and the result is a driving away of the participants for a few meetings. Meeting No. 3 seems to be the meeting that decided the counselor feelings about group outcomes, and the higher the attendance at this session, the more favorably did counselors perceive overall outcomes of the group. Other data indicated that counselors seem to have trouble establishing rapport and interaction if more than eight teachers attended the first two meetings.

There were clear relationships between attendance patterns and teachers' reactions to the group counseling experience. The total number of groups attended during Series 1 was related to the teachers' perceptions of helpfulness of the group experience and the teachers' willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to friends. The helpfulness variable was also related to attendance at Meetings 3 and 4, while the willingness to recommend participation variable was related to attendance at Meetings 3 and 5.

The pattern of correlations between the Post-Series Reaction Sheet and attendance at Series 2 changed considerably from Series 1. The total number of groups attended was strongly related to the teachers' perceptions of pupils' behavior changing for the better. Pupils' behavior changing for the better was also significantly related to attendance at Meeting No. 2, nears significance at Meeting No. 4 and is perfectly correlated with attendance at Meeting No. 5. Teachers' perceptions of a lack of negative outcomes during Series 2 was significantly related to attendance at Meeting No. 4. The size of the group and the size of the school tended to have a relationship with the Post-Series Reaction Sheet to the extent that the smaller the group and the smaller the school, the more helpful the teachers felt the group experience to have been. The teachers also perceived more pupil behavior change to take place in the smaller schools than the larger schools.

This study has settled several questions of feasibility about teacher group counseling. Public school guidance personnel can do the job of teacher group counseling. Teachers will take advantage of this opportunity when it is offered. Teachers from schools who have a higher proportion of culturally deprived minority groups tend to have better attendance patterns at these meetings than teachers from schools with a lower proportion of culturally deprived students. Teachers experience very few negative results occurring from their participation in these meetings and a high number of positive results. Public school counselor perceptions of group process variables are quite valid in terms of their relationship to teacher perceptions of outcomes and attendance patterns. More intensive research in this area is clearly needed, especially about the outcomes of teacher group counseling on their pupils, but the basic feasibility of the approach is clearly established.

References

Cook, Katharine M. The place of visiting teacher services in the school program. Bulletin No. 6, 1945, Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing office.

Gray, Susan. *The psychologist in the schools*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Kelley, J. L. Present practices in school social work. In H. W. Lundberg (Ed.), *School social work*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Loughary, J. W., Stripling, R. O., and Fitzgerald, P. W. *Counseling, a growing profession*. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

Shaw, M. C. Role delineation among the guidance professions, *J. School Psychol*., Vol. IV, No. 1, January, 1967, 3-13.

Shaw, M. C. and Rector, W. H. *Parent and counselor perceptions of their participation in group counseling*. Monograph #3 of the Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, Chico State College, October, 1966, mimeographed, 38 pp. (+ appendices).

Shaw, M.C. and Rector, W. H. *Group counseling with parents: feasibility, reactions and interrelationships*. Monograph #5 of the Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, Chico State College, May, 1968, 86 pp. (+ appendices).

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. *A proposed model and research design for pupil personnel services in the public schools*. Monograph #1 of the Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, University of California at Los Angeles, March, 1964, mimeographed, 95 pp. (+ appendices).

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. *Guidance research in action: group counseling with parents*. Monograph #2 of the Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, University of California at Los Angeles, April, 1965, mimeographed, 200 pp. (+ appendices).

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. A focus for public school guidance programs: a model and proposal, *Personnel Guid. J.*, April, 1966, 824-830.

Trachtman, G. M. New directions for school psychology. *Exceptional Children*, 1961, 28, 159-163.

APPENDIX A

Teacher ____________________

School ____________________

Consultant ____________________

Group No. ____________

Series No. ____________

POST-SERIES REACTION SHEET
(Teacher)
GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California at Los Angeles

1. Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Not at all* * * * * Very much so
1 2 3 4 5

1a. If you checked 3, 4, or 5 above, please explain briefly in what ways the discussions have been helpful.

2. Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

Not at all* * * * * Very much so
5 4 3 2 1

If you checked 3, 2, or 1 above, please explain briefly what negative results occurred.

3. Have there been any recent changes in your pupils' behavior in class and other school situations?

Not at all* * * * * Very much so
1 2 3 4 5

3a. If you checked 3, 4, or 5 above, have these changes been for the better ______ (or) worse ______. Please explain briefly the nature of these changes.

4. Would you recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers who have pupils with academic problems? Yes _____
No _____

5. What specific aspects of the group discussions did you find to be least helpful (or possibly harmful)?

6. What specific aspects of the group discussions did you find to be most helpful?

7. Please write here any feelings or reactions about your experience in this group which you have not had an opportunity to express above.

Appendix B

IMPORTANT! One of these forms is to be completed for each group at the conclusion of each series.

NOTE. When used for teacher group, observe substitutions in parentheses above text.

Consultant ____________
District ____________
School ____________
Group Number ____________ Parent ____ Teacher ____
(Circle) Series: 1 2 3
Date This Series Started: ______

COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUP

GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California, Los Angeles

1. How would you describe rapport in this group?

(Circle one)	Poor (1)	Not So Good (2)	Fair (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

(teachers)
2. How much interaction was there among parents in this group?

(Circle one)	Almost None (1)	Very Little (2)	A Fair Amount (3)	Quite A Bit (4)	A Great Deal (5)

3. How much hostility was expressed in this group?

(Circle one)	Almost None (1)	Very Little (2)	A Fair Amount (3)	Quite A Bit (4)	A Great Deal (5)

4. (Answer only if answer to above question was 3, 4 or 5.) Was this hostility directed primarily towards

(Circle one)	Self (1)	Counselor (2)	(Parents) Teachers (3)	(Own Pupils) Own Child (4)	Other Group Members (5)

5. Did the group seem to insist that you talk or lecture to them?

(Circle one)	Almost None (1)	Very Little (2)	A Fair Amount (3)	Quite A Bit (4)	A Great Deal (5)

6. What is your feeling about outcomes in this group?

(Circle One)	Poor (1)	Not So Good (2)	Fair (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

7. In a short paragraph, characterize this group and put down your reactions to it. (Use back of sheet or extra paper if necessary.)

APPENDIX C

Consultant ____________________

District ____________________

Level: Elem. Jr.Hi. Sr. Hi.
(Circle One)

GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS

GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California, Los Angeles

1. Would you recommend working with parent groups as an effective technique to other counselors?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Yes, But With Many Reservations	Yes, But With Some Reservations	Yes	Enthusiastically Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

2. Would you like to see a program of parent group counseling introduced in your own guidance system (assuming appropriate shifts in load)?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Yes, But With Many Reservations	Yes, But With Some Reservations	Yes	Enthusiastically Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3. Do you feel that your work with parent groups had any impact on their children?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Probably No	Uncertain	Probably Yes	Definitely Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3a. If "yes" (4 or 5), please describe some of the kinds of outcomes you believe occurred.

4. In a paragraph or two, please summarize your major reactions to your group counseling experience this year. Use back of sheet or extra paper if necessary.